

OFFICIAL DISPATCH

VIA: AIR
SPECIFY AIR OR SEA POUCH

DISPATCH NO. 240-200

SECRET
DECLASSIFICATION

TO: Chief of Base, Salzburg

DATE: FEB 28 1953
INFO: YES

FROM: Chief, IE

SUBJECT: GENERAL: Operational/CHOCVY
SPECIFIC: CHOCVY - CS-2 etc.

USAGE - Austria

Reference: BARA 770, SAS-4-50, BARA 125

1. BARA 770 and its attachments were read here with interest and satisfaction. It is felt that [] handled the final interview and termination of CS-2 in a thoroughly professional and commendable manner, and he should be commended for it. It is further felt that you have done all that could be done at this point to bring the various figures in this case and the relationship between them into focus. Congratulations to all of you on a job well done.

2. Headquarters is thus disposed to accept your conclusion that the CS-2 NORTH relationship did not seriously damage the security of the CHOCVY operation, but it cannot overlook certain reservations about the security of the operation as a whole.

3. Paragraph 2 d. of []'s memo of 30 January states that the interview with CS-2 made the "significant disclosure" that "NORTH knew CHOCVY worked for the American intelligence service and had on four or five occasions tried to elicit information from him regarding CHOCVY's financial status and attitude toward his work". However, may be said about CHOCVY's initiative and usefulness as a facility in Salzburg, do you not agree that "disclosures" such as this make it difficult for Headquarters to defend the project as a secure and strictly clandestine intelligence operation? By this we do not mean to intimate that we do not consider the CHOCVY operation a highly valuable one, nor that we are loath to go to bat for it - quite the contrary. However what we do want is a realistic and frank survey of the case from a CI angle so that we can put the facts forward, then justify the operation on the grounds that despite certain security implications, the production from the project is so valuable that the strengths far outweigh the weaknesses.

RELEASE

EE/FE/PO
COORDINATING OFFICER

SECRET

CLASSIFICATION

DATE: 8 NOV 1925

VB24

EE/FE/PO

INI

X REF 6000 LIFED

FORM NO. 51-20
JUN 1949

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B20
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2006

by. As to OGD's actual statements while under interrogation, we note that he states he saw not Barney HART, according to paragraph III c of 6-1-51, attached to TUSA 104, OGD was asked by HART to contact ALBERT in order to obtain E-mails which OGD was to exchange and then return the same to HART. Several explanations are possible for the discrepancy - perhaps this item did not come up, or OGD may have forgotten about the contact with HART - or not.

(Brian) Henry

6. Of interest to OGD's statement that he requested 600 satellite per month from HART, especially so in that ROY GIBSON'S SA reported that the highest OGD requested as 800 from HART. Again there are a number of possible explanations among them that a certain correspondence kept into the report as to what OGD said to GIBSON'S SA to GIBSON, another that HART claimed to give as being to OGD, but actually kept it all for himself except as 600.

7. Now we have a copy of the above mentioned transcript when it became available.

8. The point about GIBSON'S being made to realize that the relationship between intelligence operations and their sub-operations can never be exclusively a correspondence proposition, is well taken. We are glad that he has become aware of this point to deal with his people on a more human and understanding basis.

9. Regarding HART-58, we regret that the item is back to clear headquarters and is unable to be either outlined or revised.

10. With regard to HART-59, we wonder if the Congress being advised has been delayed as the Library of Congress has been lagging about the expenditure of the report.

11. Regarding TUSA 104, we note that no other opportunity of making a use has others been mentioned. However, we are hoping for approval in the near future of a use of 100 to pay salary, so that it would show some present benefit. Otherwise we can be put in whole right way.

Date of Original
10 February 1951

241
(Encl. B45A-77b)
~~6-6-51~~
E